US Bankruptcy Court Attn: Judge Dennis Montali 450 Golden Gate Avenue Mailbox 36099 San Francisco, CA. 94102



May 12, 2021

Dear Judge Montali:

I am a claimant in case no. 19-30088 (claim 2017). On March 24th, you presided over a teleconference call in which you asked opposing attorney (Ms Dara Silveira) if those claims that had been settled or objections withdrawn would be paid in a reasonable timeframe - her answer was "yes". (See attached page of transcript with your question circled).

Now, Ms Silveira is stating that although the objection to my claim had been withdrawn, it has not been allowed. She writes that what she said was... "Where there has been a resolution reached or we've withdrawn and allowed the claim, those are being paid." (Transcript at 7:15-17). Therefore, she is saying my claim has not been allowed.

I do not believe that is how you framed the question; did you interpret Ms Silveira's answer as a straightforward "yes" to your question? Did you distinguish a difference between an objection Case: 19-30088 Doc# 10659 Filed: 05/18/21 Entered: 05/18/21 16:12:52 Page 1

of 4

withdrawn and a claim being allowed?

Furthermore, after many unreturned phone calls to opposing attorneys, now they are saying they want to go backwards to ADR to resolve the claim to which I would ask...why file an objection, withdraw the objection, have a court date March 24th...if the plan was to go the ADR route? Also, this would add unnecessary time to a process that has already exceeded two years. I have had multiple unreturned phone calls to PG&E attorneys, and have had no choice but appeal to the court in writing to you again (twice) - and I am sorry for that. It is not my intention to take up valuable court time.

Any clarity you can provide would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Philip Piserchio

Mw Pm

1620 Claremont Drive

San Bruno, CA. 94066

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 10659 Filed: 05/18/21 Entered: 05/18/21 16:12:52 Page 2

of 4

Done Transcript of 03.24.20...



THE COURT: Good morning, MS. Silveira. I saw your name, and I thought you were going to be the attorney

e cribers

1977: 4% 2000) geometranspectations not focus excellent and

PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company 1 appearing. But I also saw Mr. Benvenutti's name. I'll assume you're going to answer my questions unless we hear from him. 3 So I want to make sure I'm clear what you expect when we are dealing with a claimant that have been identified as 5 being dealt with by a status conference today. And more specifically though, I want to ask a couple of fundamental 7 questions. In some of the -- obviously, a number of the matters 9 that were on for today's calendar have been continued to a 10 later date. And we don't need any discussion about that. 11 But as far as claimants where PG&E has withdrawn the 12 objection or there's been a resolution by agreement, is it fair 13 to assume that those claims will be paid in due course and 14 soon? 15 MS. SILVEIRA: Yes. Where there has been a resolution 16 reached or we've withdrawn and allowed the claim, those are 17 being paid. I believe our timeline is checks go out every two 18 to three weeks. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Again, there's no immediate 20 feedback from my point of view. And I don't know what the 21 distribution timing is. But at least claimants who are in the 22 call today, they may be more inclined to agree to things if 23 they know they're going to get paid quickly. That's for a 24 specific discussion on any particular claim.

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 10659 Filed: 05-2006 Entered: 05/18/21 16:12:52

Then next, what is your expectation for some of these

25

Piscodo, Phillip 1620 Clarement Dr. San Bruno, Ca 94066

MAY 18 2021


UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SAN FRANCISCO, CA RECEIVED

> Ath: Judge Dennis Montali Mailbox 36077 US Backruptey Court

San trancisco, CA 94102 450 Golden Gate Avenue

UNITED STATES BANKADRICY COURT RECEIVED

かいついかのしいのいかの



13 MAY 2021PM 21

Doc#.10659 Case: 19-30088 Entered: 05/18/21 16:12:52 Filed: 05/18/21 Page 4

of 4